

LEADERSHIP IN LOMA: A PRELIMINARY RESEARCH REPORT¹

KURT H. WOLFF,

Department of Sociology,
The Ohio State University, Columbus 10, Ohio

"Loma," "Justino" County, Southwest, is a relatively isolated community of some 200 people, most of them Spanish-speaking, the rest of them "Anglos," that is, non-Spanish, English-speaking "Whites." From an earlier paper on culture change in Loma,² the Spanish culture of that community appeared to be changing in the direction of the surrounding Anglo culture, with a concomitant loss of original characteristics. The topic of the present paper, leadership, suggests the adoption of an explicitly diachronic view: the "new," Anglo-influenced Loma system is contrasted with the "old," almost purely Spanish one.

At this stage of investigation, fifteen leadership types have tentatively been established. Eight of them function within the "old," and seven within the "new" system. "Old" types are the religious leader, the community leader, the man of knowledge and wisdom, the *patrón*, the *médico*, the *curandera*, the *hechicero* (*brujo*), and the prostitute; "new" types are the contractor, the creditor, the priest, the physician, the nurse, the leader in education, and the community planner. Some of the old-type leaders, of course, have left traces in the present set-up.

The *religious leader* is well exemplified by Sigismundo Campa. Some of his leadership characteristics include his organizing role in home services, his instrumentality in the building of the church (after which home services practically ceased), his influential functioning as a member and official of various religious organizations, and his wife's catechism teaching. His leadership activity is thus the development or articulation of a certain institution, religion, whereby in some respects, one of which has been mentioned, his influence is enhanced through his wife's sharing it. His wife, however, is here conceived by the Lomans merely as a person to whom some of her husband's leadership has been delegated. The religious leader does not occupy an "office" of leadership: there is, in Loma, no such office or position called "religious leader." It is rather the personality of this particular individual which makes certain activities within the institution of religion, leadership activities. As to the question whether the religious leader "belongs" to the old or the new Loma, it should be noted that an individual's seizure of available institutional opportunities for leadership is, by itself, no more characteristic of the old than of the new system. What does characterize the old system is the fact that the institution chosen is that of religion. Other types of leaders use other institutions, which are more characteristic of the new system.

¹Field work in Loma was done in 1942 and 1944; in 1944, on a Social Science Research Council fellowship. Writing up was begun in 1948 and continued in 1949, under grants from The Viking Fund, Inc., and the Graduate School, The Ohio State University. In the summer of 1947, a graduate student spent several weeks in Loma under the joint direction of Dr. John W. Bennett and myself (all of Ohio State University); material collected by this student is part of the sources utilized here. To these organizations and persons I gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness. My special thanks go to Richard T. Morris and Melvin Seeman for most helpful discussions, and to the field worker just mentioned (who for the sake of Loma's anonymity must unfortunately remain unidentified) for stimulating correspondence, regarding a first draft of the present paper.

²Kurt H. Wolff, "Culture Change in Loma: A Preliminary Research Report," *The Ohio Journal of Science*, 50: 53-59, March, 1950. See this paper, also, for a description of the Loma Institute and the Justino Plan referred to several times in the present study.

The *community leader* is similar, for he, too, is without office and develops existing institutions. He differs, however, not only because the area within which he exercises influence is not religion, but also because it is a variety of institutions, rather than one or two closely related ones. In the example at hand, Alejandro Maes, these institutions are education, economics, and justice. Maes gave the land on which the first school house was built, and for many years he was a member of the school board. For some time in the past, he was considered the best farmer, organized co-operative work at the seasonal times it was carried on by tradition, and took a lead in the administration of irrigation. For many years he was the justice of the peace. Yet although school board member, water commissioner, and justice of the peace are well-defined offices in Loma, Alejandro is a leader not because he occupies these offices, but, once more as in the case of Sigismundo Campa, because of his personality, particularly because of his Loma-wide interest. In fact, he probably occupies office because of his leadership, which endows his official actions with an importance that other office holders do not derive from their mere occupancy.

The same individual also is the *man of knowledge and wisdom*, a designation which refers to no office whatever, for the only related existing position is that of teacher, which has, however, always been filled by a woman. The area in which Maes exercises leadership in his capacity of man of knowledge includes that in which he acts as a community leader, but it is broader than economics, education and justice, since it includes many other, miscellaneous matters. His influence here consists in imparting knowledge and wisdom and in inspiring confidence and security through such communication. Nor does he carry on or articulate existing institutions; he rather perpetuates the whole perspective and orienting character of tradition.

In the cases of all three of these leaders, acts by others that are similar to those committed by them may be observed by the outsider, and may be classified as leadership acts. But they are not so defined by the Lomans: religious, community, and knowledge leaderships are given only to Campa and Maes, respectively.

The *patrón* represents a type different from those thus far considered. Not only is his office clearly established, but it also is of such a nature that it gives physical power to whomever holds it. Unfortunately, very little else is as certainly known about the office of *patrón* and of its characteristics as is this. For instance, it is not sure whether the *patrón* merely was the largest landholder who had hired men or tenants working for him, or whether he was a full-fledged feudal baron, on however modest a scale. In either case, because of the office he occupies, he exerts economic power. Adriano Orlando Maes, at any rate, the only-known (perhaps the only) *patrón* Loma ever had, Alejandro Maes' father, was a leader in many other respects as well. Several among these leadership spheres were probably not included in the definition of his office but were due, as in the cases of the leaders thus far described, to his personality. Adriano seems to have played a role similar to that of his son, inasmuch as he, in his day, was an over-all leader in an even more extensive sense than that in which Alejandro is or was: he preceded Sigismundo Campa in religious affairs; he had the welfare of the community at heart (for instance, he donated the land for the cemetery and in fact made and planted the first cross); he had influence in matters of education, health, various customs, and, of course, in economics; and he was generally the man of knowledge and wisdom. In the course of economic change, the office of *patrón* itself has disappeared, and the leadership associated with it by its particular occupant has been transmitted to other personalities, as has in part already been seen. It is safe to assume that in becoming plural, the leaderships also have become specialized, but not to the point of institutionalization in offices. It is true that now there are the offices of teacher, county agent (agricultural-economic), priest, physician, and more, but these have not developed historically from the *patrón*, but are all of them imported.

Because of the power connected with the office of *patrón*, its occupant has a position of leadership irrespective of personality. The *patrón* may therefore be called an "office leader," and his office may be said to give its occupant "office leadership." The following three leadership types that are characteristic of the old Loma system have certain similarities with that of the *patrón*. It is not clear, however, whether *médico*, *curandera*, and *hechicero* (*brujo*) are leaders merely by virtue of their respective offices, or whether anybody who exercises their respective functions and thus articulates the institutions of health and witchcraft, respectively, thereby becomes a leader. It is not clear, in other words, whether healing and witchcraft are offices, units in the institutions of health and, say, the sacred or magic, or whether they themselves are institutions. At any rate, in the case of the first two, it is not power, and in the case of the *hechicero* it is not physical or secular but sacred power, which makes them leaders. The *médico* performs the function of physician, particularly of psychosomatic physician, which, with the addition of midwife, also is the function of the *curandera*. But while the patients of the *curandera* are predominantly women and children, those of the *médico* are predominantly men. Both satisfy health needs, but they also have some measure of sacred power. This is more clear-cut in the case of the *médico* than of the *curandera*, for the former more clearly than the latter is the counter-agent of the *hechicero* (*brujo*), the practitioner of witchcraft or sorcery. Witchcraft is as little a full-time occupation as is leadership in matters of religion, the community, and of general knowledge and wisdom. Nor is witchcraft altogether a specialty in the sense of exclusive monopolization by the witch, for certain arts of witchcraft, particularly casting the evil eye, are exercised by a number of other individuals, men and women. In a similar fashion, not all cases of bewitching require the services of the *médico* or *curandera*; often familiarity with the witch's tricks or special piety, possessed by several persons of both sexes, suffice to exorcise the spell. To repeat, it is difficult to decide, before the pertinent data are more carefully analyzed, whether the *hechicero* is an office leader or whether anybody who commits an act of witchcraft thereby, and for that time,³ becomes a leader merely by virtue of his articulating the institution of witchcraft. A parallel question must be entered in regard to the *médico* and the *curandera*.

The *prostitute's* influence consists in the introduction to sex life and in the channelization of the evil component in human nature. The former influence refers to younger boys, but the latter to mature people and, though differentially to men and women, not to men alone. It is uncertain, in fact, whether Lamberta had many or even any regular customers among those whose sex life was settled, especially through marriage. But her influence is nevertheless felt among fellow villagers in their treatment of her, which takes cognizance of her role and yet is friendly and respectful. There are good grounds for believing that prostitution is, or rather was, an institution. If this is correct, there is a further case of office or institutional leadership.

In Table I, five aspects of the leadership types characteristic of the old Loman system are brought toward greater, even if still preliminary and tentative, systematization. Two of these aspects, presented in the last two columns, have not been specifically discussed but will be understandable from the discussion given. It should be observed that in the case of the *patrón*, the office, rather than Antonio Orlando Maes' occupancy, has been analyzed. It will further be noted that a concept so often discussed in connection with leadership, that of status, has not specifically been treated here. By implication, however, a certain aspect of it can easily be inferred from the fourth column of Table I: this column in effect says that within the area described in it, the respective leader has the highest status, although

³"Leadership," of course, does not imply continuous leadership action but only recognized availability (of person or office) for such action.

other individuals may exercise influence within the same area. Thus, in the area of religion, the religious leader has the highest status, but other persons may, and in fact do, have religious influence as well—as is true, for instance, not only of particularly religious individuals but also of such more institutionally defined

TABLE I
ASPECTS OF LEADERSHIP IN THE OLD SOCIO-CULTURAL SYSTEM OF LOMA

LEADERSHIP	RELATION TO INSTITUTION(S)	PERSONAL, OFFICE, AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS	AREA OF INFLUENCE	MEANS OF INFUENCE	ETHICAL ASPECT
Religious	Articulating available institution(s) (religion, church)	Personal	Religion	Precept and interpretation	Good
Community	Articulating available institutions (economics, education, justice)	Personal	Community affairs	Precept and advice	Good
Knowledge and Wisdom	Perpetuating perceptive and orienting aspects of tradition	Personal	Knowledge and wisdom	Advice	Good
Patrón	Fixing power distribution	Office	Power	Physical power	Neutral
Médico	Articulating institution of health	Office or Institutional	Men's health	Superior knowledge and sacred power	Good
Curandera	Same	Same	Women's and children's health	Same	Same
Hechicero	Articulating institution of witchcraft	Same	Magic	Sacred power	Bad
Prostitute	Channelizing aspects of sex and of evil	Institutional	Sex and ethics and morals	Potential and actual physical contact	Compensated; choice of the relatively better for the relatively worse

persons as the officials of religious organizations; but these are not considered leaders. The peculiarity of the first three leaderships, as has been stated, is that their respective areas are defined by the Lomans in terms of the leaders' personalities. "Highest status," therefore, here is synonymous with "only status," inasmuch as no other person has status at all. Comparable ramifications could be

formulated in regard to the other areas of influence. At any rate, status refers to a leader within a given area, not to leadership.⁴

Before presenting new-system leaderships, several questions must be discussed. One concerns a definition of "leadership" itself: it refers to the exercises of significant influence within a socio-cultural system—Loma is conceived as such a system. If the leadership types discussed are inspected, it appears that "significant" influence refers to one which affects the system itself—corroborating it by confirmation or articulation, questioning it, or changing it. (In the present case, there are instances only of corroborating influence. The system has changed, not because of leadership but because of other reasons, as was indicated, especially in the paper on culture change referred to in note 2 above.) Leadership thus must not be confused with other influences within a system, which, of course, are innumerable. In the first place, in addition to affecting the system, it must also be concentrated, rather than diffused. It may be concentrated in an office or institution, or in a person, instances of all of which are found in Loma. But farmers, fathers, mothers, etc., exert influences and thereby affect the system—in Loma once more in the corroborating sense. They are not considered leaders because their influences are not concentrated. Thus, one connotation of the fact that prostitution is breaking down as an institution is the diffusion of the occupant's influence, a phenomenon that is widely observed in contemporary urban cultures also.

In the second place, there is no leadership office alone. Suppose the office of *patrón* is vacant. In such a case, leadership by mere occupancy has been replaced by an impersonal portion of the socio-cultural system, the distribution of power and land (and concomitant customs, beliefs, etc.). It may be added that since this particular portion of the system involves power, it will, after a relatively short time, either be personalized (by occupancy) or abolished (by some socio-economic change). But by itself it constitutes no leadership, although it does, even without the occupant's co-operation, bestow it upon him. Thus, leadership is seen to have a further requirement, namely, that it be exercised by an individual.⁵ Moreover, the leader must be a living individual. If, for instance, a person says, "Christ is my leader," he may actually have no leader whatever (if he should really "live by" nothing then Christian doctrine, which is extremely improbable) but is talking about a value system or a religious conviction, in short, about his culture; or else he actually has other leaders, such as his wife or a teacher or a minister. With his death, Christ ceased to be a leader. He was later replaced by the church, an institution with many offices and office leaderships in numerous socio-cultural systems other than itself—among them, in Loma (though in a more articulate, even if weaker, fashion, only in its new phase).

How does the student of a system know—it may be asked—what leadership positions meet the requirements developed? Obviously, he must have a certain knowledge of the system itself before he can even develop hypotheses regarding the concentration of influences that act upon it. Space permits no more than a few, rather apodictic remarks, which are, however, necessary to further the

⁴In the latter case, status could only denote the position of a particular leadership within an order of leaderships. This usage is not employed in the present paper, although some of the following discussion might suggest it. Furthermore, no more refined analysis of the leader's status has been undertaken, such as would be entailed by a differentiation of statuses into "subjective," "objective," "specific," "general" (all to be defined), or what other subdivisions might seem desirable. The reason for this failure is not skepticism concerning the utility of such subdivisions, but once more the present stage of analyzing the data. Toward the end of this paper, however (n. 10 and text preceding it), a scheme will be presented which suggests a certain classification of leader statuses.

⁵There is no reason why it could not be exercised by a group, a clique perhaps, but no such instance was found in Loma.

argument.⁶ The student identifies himself as best he can with the system he is studying. He will thus eventually get some sort of picture which has elements existing on the part of the participants in the system, and others existing on the part of the student. The presentation itself of the picture he has gained amounts to its translation into his and his readers' culture. No Loman, for instance, would ever dream of thinking up Table I, nor can he understand it, unless he is familiar with anthropological or sociological thought. But in that case, his culture would have been enriched or replaced by another, precisely, by the current social-science universe of discourse.⁷

In the "new" Loma system, the leaderships—to repeat—are contractor, creditor, priest, physician, nurse, leader in education, and community planner. They can be discussed much more briefly, in part because they are more similar to one another than are the "old" types, in part because they are well known to the readers of this paper. With the exception of the last two, they are office leaderships. The *contractor* (Patricio Campa, a nephew of Sigismundo, the "old" religious leader) and the *creditor* (the Anglo trader) have taken over most of the economic functions, and thus of the power, that once were part of the *patrón's* leadership. The *priest* (an Anglo) has to a considerable extent replaced the religious leader; the *physician*, the *médico*; and the *nurse*, the *curandera*. But Sigismundo Campa still plays some role, and the officials of the religious organizations combine minor office leadership with reminiscences, both on their own part and on the part of those with whom they interact, of a less institutionalized, more spontaneous and personal religious life. Neither have the old-time representatives of health and un-health completely died out: some old people still resort to traditional medicines and cures, with or without the help of *médico* or *curandera*, believe in witchcraft, especially the evil eye, and take prophylactic and therapeutic measures against it, although a *hechicero* has not been known in the community for a long time.

The *leader in education* is represented predominantly by the public-school teacher, but also by government officials (such as the county agent), whose efforts, on the whole, consist in using educational measures for bridging the gap between the old and the new systems. During the existence of the Loma Institute, some of its staff members, especially the president and his wife, exercised a tenuous and short-lived personal leadership, largely if not wholly irrespective of either the institution of education or of the newly created Institute itself. While there is educational leadership due to the permanent existence of school and various governmental agencies, there was *community planning* only during the existence of the Loma Institute and the Justino Plan; and here again, the leadership was exercised by the Institute's president and his immediate staff. He took it over from the Plan with its seat in Justino, exercised it locally, and had begun to delegate some of it to certain villagers. With the demise of the two organizations, however, the function of community planning itself died out, too.

⁶Cf. Kurt H. Wolff, "A Methodological Note on the Empirical Establishment of Culture Patterns," *American Sociological Review*, 10: 176-184, April, 1945.

⁷The old-system leadership presented can be contrasted not only with that of the new system, but also with systems outside of Loma. The most fruitful manner of undertaking such a more general comparison would probably be to refine the dimensions described in the columns of Table I in order to make them more clearly defined; this almost certainly would involve revisions and additions. Once some such improvement is achieved, however (and it is hoped that the further analysis of the Loma materials itself will contribute toward it), a usable typology of leaderships may be looked forward to. Yet the variables and their articulations as suggested in Table I are so numerous that, from the standpoint of economy, a more advisable procedure might be to begin, rather, with a typology of socio-cultural systems. For, in this manner the multidimensionality of the leadership typology might be reduced in consideration of empirical requirements. The possibility of socio-cultural systems without leadership (in the specific sense defined) should not be overlooked in such an undertaking.

If this is correct, why should these processes have occurred? This question suggests a further analysis of the relation between leadership and the socio-cultural system, Loma. The system, it has been shown over and over, has been changing to the extent of imposing upon its student the distinction between an old and a new phase. Yet despite the fact (documented in the paper on culture change referred to before) that the contemporary Spanish culture of Loma—at least of the younger generation—is indeed a mixture of Spanish and Anglo elements, leadership in the old system strikes one as somehow more effective than in the new. One suspects something that is common to all the old-system leadership types, in spite of the differences among them that have been pointed out; and conversely, one suspects something common to all the new types. This common feature may tentatively be stated as the fact, in the old system, that the relation to the leader is an “end” relation, because leadership, whether of office or of person, is the implementation of an unquestioned common-value system. And it is the contrasting fact, in the new system, that the relation to the leader is a “means” relation, not because leadership is in conflict with (or irrelevant to) a value system which would correspond to the new system, but because there is no unquestioned common-value system that is developed to a point where it could be implemented by leadership. The personal leaderships in religion, the community, and knowledge were accorded their representatives because the practice and promotion of religious tenets and rituals, the solution of community problems or of individuals’ problems that bore on the community’s welfare, and the dispensation of knowledge and wisdom through personally skillful resort to tradition were values in Loman culture, ends sought for their own sake. It was good to be pious, to have questions answered that referred to one’s own welfare in its relation to that of the community, as well as to many other matters concerning which knowledge or wisdom were deemed good. It was good to be or to serve the *patrón*—merely to resent him as an oppressive power would not have made for stability.⁸ It was good that there should have been a *médico* and a *curandera*, for both helped restore health, and even though they were used as means to attain this end, their occasional failure showed that they were not human means but God’s instruments for showing his will, and thus they had to be dealt with as ends in themselves. It is likely that the sacred power attributed to witchcraft and to the *hechicero* permits the application of a similar dialectic by which he, too, is seen to have become an end; but the precise process in which this might have been brought about is not known, at least not at this stage of analysis. Finally, although it was bad that man should have an evil component which shows itself especially in his sex appetite, it was good that there should have been a prostitute, for this institution controlled the appetite, and the person who performed this function therefore imposed respect.

There are some further implications of the old leadership type which must be brought out before it is contrasted with the new. One is that the old leader had to make little use of coercive power. The other is that the possibility of maintaining end relations with the leader was facilitated by the smallness of the community. This also provides the opportunity for “over-all” relations with him: people knew the religious leader, the community leader, the man of knowledge, even the *patrón* and the prostitute, not only in these capacities (in fact, it was mentioned that the second and third leaderships were lodged in the same individual) but in many others as well; they knew them as fellow citizens generally. The concomitance of over-all and end relation does not apply so clearly to the *médico*, the *curandera*, and the *hechicero*, because their specializations usually were

⁸This statement illustrates (rather than contradicts) the ethical characterization, “neutral,” of the *patrón* office, as given in Table I. The office itself is neutral, but may be defined in a given culture as good or bad, according to whether it is accepted or resented. It can be accepted (rather than merely accommodated to for a time) only if it is incorporated as a value in the culture, that is, presumably, in a certain number of certain individuals.

too expensive for one community to support. It is probable, therefore, that end relations were maintained with them in several communities, while over-all relations developed in only one of them, in their place of residence.

A third point concerns political leaders. It will be noted that they are listed neither in the old nor in the new system. Yet *políticos* have been known to individual Lomans since long before the old system began to change. In spite of this familiarity with the type, the politician seems never to have played any leadership role, especially perhaps because there has never been a local *político*. The *político* is defined as an individual who plays politics on the side, as a part-time specialist. He throws dances and hands out liquor and is paid for it by the political machine. But he is not a boss, and no trace of bossism has been found that would have reached into Loma, much less have centered there. He can be called a leader only if the area within which he so functions is clearly understood not to be connected with the common-value system, although the common values apply to the treatment of the politician as a person as they do to that of all others, leaders or no. The politician, along with the *patrón* and the religious leader, tied (however tenuously) Loma to the outside Spanish world which was governed by politics and by comparatively far-flung economic, power, and religious relations. How little politics is part of the common-value system is shown by the fact that even one of the most specifically political acts, casting the ballot, is not governed by it but by other values, especially by family and similar traditions.⁹

Behavior of this sort has been labeled "individualism," but this is a misnomer. For it is governed, not by more or less self-relying decisions but by common, though not by political values. Nevertheless, there is individualism in Loma, that is, behavior on personal rather than on common premises. Individualism governs personal relations where these are not governed by the common values—religious, familial, communal, etc. It does not govern relations when these have the capacity of maintaining the social order. The order is accepted, which is as much as to say, a value is valued. The individual as such is appraised and esteemed or not, according to the appraiser's own value system. Mr. McIntire, the trader, is not highly esteemed, but he is often chosen as one of the water officials, because both the regulation of the water and harmony with the creditor are valuable, and also because Mr. McIntire has proved satisfactory in the office of ditch boss or water commissioner. Lomans thus distinguish various roles of the same person. Office roles are defined, and a given individual, if the system makes him a candidate for a certain office, achieves it by rules that themselves are part of the system. Office roles are probably more numerous than are personal roles. These, in turn, are considerably less clearly defined, and their attainment depends much less on the system, since this system here only limits the range of individual achievement on the part of both role player and participant or participants in the relation to which the role is relevant.

All this is pertinent to leadership not only in the old, but also in the new system. The most general statement that can be made about the new order is that all of the characteristics of the old are either absent or in a state of confusion. That there is no common-value system that is implemented in leadership types has been anticipated. There are no leaders, in other words, to whom relations constitute ends rather than means. It may be added that the relatively neat distinction between office roles and personal roles, with their differential ascription and achievement and their relations to common and personal value systems, has

⁹Thus, one of the women who were most in sympathy with the Institute's viewpoint, who was most interested in national affairs, who, in fact, had assumed some leadership in putting over communal, educational, and health plans originated by the Loma Institute and Justino Plan, and who had consistently expressed her agreement with the New Deal and with President Roosevelt, voted the straight Republican ticket because her nephew ran for county office.

disappeared, because the cohesive principle of the old society and culture, a common-value system, has been succeeded by another principle, the desire to overcome insecurity or impotence and to gain security or power. But since this is not a cohesive principle, it can not function as the old one did.

The contractor and the public-school teacher (as well as sometimes a doctor or a nurse) are the only Spanish leaders characteristic of the new system. For this reason they are less mere means than are the remaining leaders, all of whom are Anglos and, with the exception of the creditor and the Institute president while he was functioning, non-residents. It is understandable, therefore, that the relations with the contractor and the teacher should be less specialized and more over-all than are those with the other types. And although the office and personal roles of Patricio Campa, the contractor, and corresponding relations to him can be clearly distinguished from one another, his office itself has not gained the dignity of the older offices. The contractor does not implement a value; he provides a job. On the other hand, Filiberta Tejada, the teacher, is merely a specialist who otherwise is a Loman woman. Attitudes toward her as a specialist vary with the conception of education itself as something uninspiring that has come to be taken for granted or as an imported imposition of doubtful merit or as a prestige-giving acquisition. In no event is it a common value which the teacher would implement.

Relations with the remaining types are predominantly office relations, though not exclusively. To the extent that they are, they are specialized rather than over-all. The purest exemplification of a "means" relation is that with Mr. McIntire. Although differing from individual to individual, it is characterized, both on the part of the Spanish people and on his own, by bargaining. It is perhaps because of the area within which this relation obtains, economics, that it shows the new type of leadership in such purity, for it is harder to reduce the relation with and of the priest, the physician, and the nurse, to pure bargaining. The priest's office has all the dignity required to implement a common value, but here it is the occupant who falls short of his office. Yet it must be observed that already the priest's is no longer only an office leadership, since the office itself has lost significance. Church attendance is an indication of this, as are statements made both by the priest and by numerous Lomans of both sexes and various ages. Religion is no more a common value for all Lomans. Those who participate least in the old system (a group which to a considerable extent, but not entirely, is composed of the younger men) find religion least satisfying and are either confused or motivated individually by a quest for economic security or power.

The physician and the nurse are used, if at all, as means to attain the specific ends for which their respective offices equip them (though not with the bargaining characteristics of the creditor relation), or are received or resorted to with diffidence and suspicion as foreign importations (somewhat less so in case they are Spanish), or are treated as if they were *médicos* or *curanderas*. The relations to them thus are either specialized or confused. And finally, what influence the short-lived educator and community planner from the Loma Institute had was based on personal relations rather than on the establishment of common values and on participation in them. What, if anything, he had created in the way of offices thus disappeared with the removal of his person.

Before coming to a conclusion regarding leadership in Loma and implications for our own society, it may be clarifying to summarize the characteristics of leadership discussed in reference to Loma, but presumably applicable generally.

(1) Definition of leadership: the exercise of influence within a socio-cultural system, which influence (a) affects (corroborates, questions, changes) the system, (b) is concentrated in an office (institution) or person(s), rather than being diffused, and (c) is exercised by a person (or by persons) living within (or possibly outside) the socio-cultural system at the time the system is a going concern.

(2) The type of leadership is determined by its (a) relations to an institution or institutions within (or outside) the system, (b) being office (institutional), or personal leadership, (c) its area of influence, (d) its means of influence, (e) its ethical aspect or aspects, whereby (c) through (e) must be analyzed as office and personal characteristics in accordance with the information required under (b).

(3) The type of leader himself is determined by (a) the relations obtaining between him and other, differential individuals and groups, whereby end and means relations, over-all and specialized relations, and social and personal relations must be distinguished; (b) the roles played by him, which may be office roles or personal roles; (c) his status which, by definition, is the highest (or only) one within a given area (or areas) of influence and which may be analyzed further (a step not taken in the present paper) in regard to subjective status (the leader's definition of his status), accorded status (the status given the leader by differential individuals and groups), and system status (the status accorded the leader by the student of the socio-cultural system in which the leader functions, on the basis of the student's construction and presentation of this system); (d) the way in which the leader attains leadership, for which knowledge of (a), (b), and (c) is pertinent, particularly in regard to the application of ascription and achievement to (a), (b), and (c) and their subdivisions.¹⁰

Table I sketched (2) (a) through (e) for all leadership types of the old Loma system. Subsequent discussion, set by (1), arrived at (1) (a), (b), and (c), and discussion transitional to a presentation of leadership in the new system and this discussion itself yielded (3) (a) through (d) and subdivisions, though without tabulation and even without analysis of all points. Yet a further aspect of leadership has been touched upon at length but does not appear in the above schema because it is not yet clear even to the point where it could be incorporated there. This aspect is the relation between the system of common values (as a part of culture, which in turn is part of the socio-cultural system) and leadership. All that can be done at the present stage concerning this aspect is to clarify its theoretical and methodological status.

(1) To grasp the relation between a "common-value system" and leadership is extremely important for an understanding of (a) culture change, (b) the failure or success of change measures introduced into a system, and (c) the stability or instability of a system.

¹⁰The following schema is an abridgement of the last three paragraphs:

- (1) Leadership defined as influence in a socio-cultural system which
 - (a) affects system,
 - (b) is concentrated (office, person),
 - (c) is exercised by living person(s);
- (2) Leadership type determined by

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) institutional relations, (b) office- or personal nature, (c) influence area (d) influence means (e) ethical aspect 	}	to be analyzed as office and personal characteristics;
--	---	--
- (3) Leader type determined by
 - (a) relation:
 1. end, means,
 2. over-all, specialized,
 3. social, personal;
 - (b) role:
 1. office,
 2. personal;
 - (c) status:
 1. subjective,
 2. accorded,
 3. system;
 - (d) attainment manner.

(2) The relation between the "common-value system" and leadership is not clear beyond the observation of cases in which the latter seems, and does not seem, to "implement" the former; nor is the connection between "end relations" and "common-value system" obvious beyond the suggestion that both seem to "go together."

(3) The relation between the "common-value system" and "culture" is not clear beyond the suggestions, (a) that the former is the "most important part" of the latter, and (b) that it may be absent from it; nor is the connection between "common-value system," "area" (of influence), and "culture" evident.

(4) "Stability" and "instability" of a culture need definitions which must be undertaken in conjunction with efforts to define the relations between "culture," "common-value system," and "area," because it is hoped that such a combined attack may lead to satisfying the quest for understanding indicated under (1) above.

This quest has been at least one of the motives for studying Loma in general, and its aspects, among them leadership, in particular. The idea has been, and still is, that once a unique culture is grasped—and the culture of Loma, like any culture, is conceived as a unique—an understanding of other uniques, including our own culture, will be furthered.¹¹ For, it is hoped that generalizations will emerge from such a procedure which are more tenable than are those derived from viewing Loma as a mere variant of our own set-up—a view that is based on the notion that people are "generally" alike no matter where they are. And it will have been noted that throughout the last portions of this paper, and particularly in some passages, such as in the descriptions of religious change and of voting behavior, problems have been discussed which can be seen, even at this stage in the analysis of the Loma materials, to be our own. More specifically, one of the most important problems which not only Loma and we, but the major part of the world have been and are facing is how to create a common-value system (whatever the definition of this term) which can implement types of leadership. Closely related to this problem is the question of how long a socio-cultural system can exist without doing more about this problem than asking how it might be solved.¹²

¹¹Cf. Kurt H. Wolff, "The Unique and the General: Toward a Philosophy of Sociology," *Philosophy of Science*, 15: 192-210, July, 1948.

¹²A further methodological-theoretical note may be in order. If this paper makes any contribution to the study of leadership, it is through whatever theoretical suggestiveness it may possess, rather than through the rigorous application of a fully developed theory to empirical materials (for, many Loma materials have not yet been analyzed) or through methodological stimulation (hardly any methodology has been indicated). The following comments are offered to show a partial awareness of these shortcomings. The paper is descriptive rather than explanatory or analytical. To mention only two of the many "why" questions neither raised nor answered: Why was no "common-value system" the outcome of such concerted efforts as were made by the Loma Institute and the Justino Plan? Why did the *patrón's* son become a leader? Or, analytically: is there such a thing as inheritance of leadership? Is there "conversion" of leadership from one area to another? And most concepts in addition to those discussed in the last pages require further clarification and inter-relation also.